



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Sixth. Non-interference by Russia with the territories on the frontiers of Georgia and Persia.

Seventh. Payment in gold for goods exported or imported between Russia and Great Britain.

Eighth. A régime of commercial equality for Russia and Great Britain in the autonomous States on the western front.

AT A GENERAL COUNCIL of the League of Nations Union, held in London March 5, over which Lord Cecil presided, it was voted that any international control established either over the Straits or Constantinople, should be subject to the League of Nations. It also was reiterated that Turkish rule over subject nationalities should be abolished, and that the latter should be placed under the tutelage of one or more of the mandatorial powers of the League of Nations, in accordance with Article XXII of the League of Nations Covenant.

This statement of objections to continuance of the Sultan's power over Christian populations had its echo in formal protests to the Supreme Council by the leaders of the Anglican and Nonconformist churches of England and also in a letter from the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States to the Archbishop of Canterbury to this effect:

"We are grateful for your leadership in the crusade against the proposed retention of the Turks in Constantinople and the spoliation of Armenia. Any compromise with the Turks will be a condonation of crime and will outrage the conscience of Christendom. We believe that Armenia, land-locked and robbed of her fairest portions, cannot achieve real independence or self-support.

"We respectfully, but energetically, protest against the proposed measures and appeal to the people of Great Britain to prevent the perpetration of a fresh act of injustice against the martyr, Armenia. The American people have always placed implicit faith in the pledges of Great Britain. We cannot believe that Great Britain will disappoint us by failing to do full justice to Armenia."

## LETTER BOX

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 12, 1920.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE:

In the issue of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE for January the Editor says on page three: "The Sterling bill (S. 3317) as passed by the Senate, now before the Judiciary Committee of the House, provides that it shall be 'Unlawful for any person to advise or advocate the overthrow . . . by force or violence . . . of the Government of the United States, or to advise or advocate a change in the Constitution of the United States, or resistance to the authority thereof by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property.' Such language enacted into law, however worthy the motives of the author, will defeat its own ends. What, for example, does the Senator mean by 'force'? Furthermore, after a careful reading of the bill, we are convinced that it provides that it shall be unlawful for any person to 'advise or advocate a change in the form of government or the Constitution of the United States.' Good lawyers agree that it means just that. If that is so, and such language becomes the law of the land, what becomes of that other language, out of which has grown pretty much all of what we call

American liberty, namely, that 'governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to those ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness'?"

It seems to me that the Editor of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE has not given the above-quoted clause from the Sterling bill that construction which the words clearly import and which the author clearly intended. The unlawful acts provided against in the bill are the advocacy of the "overthrow, by force or violence, of the Government of the United States," not the expression of an opinion that the present form of government of the United States is undesirable and should be changed; the advocacy of "a change in the form of government in the Constitution of the United States or resistance to the authority thereof by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property," not the advocacy of amendments to the Constitution of the United States by the simple, easy, and peaceful means provided for by that instrument for effecting a change in that Constitution.

As a lawyer of many years' standing and study of the construction of statutory law, I think that the only rational construction to be put on the quoted clause of the Sterling bill is that the advising and advocating of changes in our government provided against are those to be accomplished by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property.

The Editor asks in the article quoted from, "What does the Senate mean by 'force'?" In the connection in which the word is used, there can be but one meaning—an illegal force. Not the moral force of an opinion, but force not peaceful. "Force," "violence," "physical injury to person or property," as used in the text, are simply cumulative expressions of the same idea and have substantially the same meaning.

I firmly believe that our Supreme Court, if the question should ever be presented to them, will not construe the meaning of the Sterling bill in any other way than that above indicated.

There is much agitation at present over the question of the limitation of free speech. Men have been excluded from legislative bodies for expressing and advocating radical changes in our State and national governments, but it will be found that in each case violence forms a part of their scheme of reform, to be resorted to if the people do not tamely agree to the radical ideas of the would-be reformers. This the American people will not consent to.

LE ROY PARKER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., February 14, 1920.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

FRIENDS: Please find enclosed check for \$5. From this sum please prepay a year's subscription to the ADVOCATE OF PEACE for E. B. R. Please similarly prepay a year's subscription for the library of the Hollywood High School, Los Angeles. . . . We are giving the above subscriptions as a graduating present. We lean upon the ADVOCATE.

S. S. M.

GLOUCESTER, MASS., March 10.

EDITOR THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE:

Referring to the article on page 53 of the February issue of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE, on "Honesty," by J. H. R., it seems to me that it goes too far toward anarchy, and instead of promoting peace would in practice bring war. When you take away property rights you destroy the incentive to labor and industry.

I hope this will not be the trend of your paper, as I think it is not in the direction of peace. I have no desire for argument. I simply wish to register my protest.

Yours truly,

NATHANIEL BABSON.